

JUNE 17, 2014

ROLL CALL: MARY BRADLEY, CARL ELLIS, SONNY JONES, KEN KERKHOFF, ANN MILLER AND OWEN ROBERTS WERE PRESENT. ALSO PRESENT WERE MAYOR BRIAN TRAUGOTT AND CITY ATTORNEY BILL MOORE.

DEPT. HEADS: BART MILLER, JOHN WILHOIT AND ALLISON WHITE WERE PRESENT REPRESENTING THEIR RESPECTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY BRADLEY TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 3, 2014 MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

The vote is as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY JONES TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 12, 2014 SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

The vote is as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received

Council member Ken Kerkhoff addressed a request by Laura Dake for the City to conduct a traffic study of KY33 and the proposed Walmart development area by further distributing a letter from the Kentucky Department of Transportation stating the seven (7) traffic issues they were studying. Mr. Kerkhoff expressed that he was of the opinion that the Kentucky Department of Transportation should be the agency to study and/or address any traffic issues and that the City should support their (KYDOT) due diligence.

At the request of Council member Bradley, City Attorney Moore gave second reading of Ordinance No. 2014-30 as follows:

**CITY OF VERSAILLES, KENTUCKY
ORDINANCE NO. 2014-30**

**A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT
ARTICLE VII, B-3 DISTRICT
SECTION 715**

WHEREAS, the Versailles-Midway-Woodford County Planning Commission has, after public hearings, and otherwise according to law recommended that Article VII, B-3 District, Section 715 be amended;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL, that the Versailles-Midway-Woodford County Zoning Ordinance -Article VII, Section 715 be amended as follows:

~~715 PLANNED SHOPPING CENTER (B-3)~~

~~715.1 Intent~~

~~The intent of the Planned Shopping Center (B-3) zone is to ensure development of and for commercial purposes and the expansion of existing shopping centers in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. The protective standards contained in this provision are intended to:~~

~~A. Assure convenience by providing commercial areas of sufficient size and in the proper location to convenient the people of the area in relation to their purchasing power and their needs and demands for goods and services.~~

~~B. Assure traffic safety and provide for the improvement of major thoroughfare traffic capacities by properly locating and grouping commercial areas and by designing such commercial areas so as to provide safe and convenient access thereto and adequate off street parking for automotive vehicles and by effectively separating vehicular from pedestrian traffic both within the commercial area and on adjacent public right-of-ways.~~

JUNE 17, 2014

- ~~C. Provide for service vehicles by including convenient access and loading facilities in the design of commercial areas.~~
- ~~D. A neighborhood shopping center is one which provides for the sale of so called convenience goods such as food, drugs, hardware and personal services.~~
- ~~E. A community or regional shopping center which provides not only convenience goods, but a wider range of facilities for the sale of "shopping goods" such as apparel and home furnishings, as well as banking and professional services and recreation, with the regional center generally containing larger facilities.~~
- ~~F. Protect adjacent residential neighborhoods from depreciation of property values resulting from commercial overzoning and from the over development or intrusion of undesirable commercial uses.~~
- ~~G. Promote community attractiveness by encouraging the design of commercial areas which will integrate with residential areas by utilizing effectively topographic features, transitional areas, and the liberal application of landscaping and screening devices; thus minimizing any adverse effect of any such commercial area upon adjacent land uses and providing a pleasant environment for the shopping and working experience.~~
- ~~H. Improve the economic base and tax structure of the Woodford County area by encouraging the development of stable, economically sound, commercial concentrations.~~
- ~~I. Protect the investments of existing and future commercial concentrations by providing the basis for convenient and stable commercial development through the application of sound planning principles.~~

~~715.2 Permitted Uses~~

~~The uses permitted in an integrated shopping center shall be those retail businesses, commercial, and service uses in the B-1 Neighborhood District of this Ordinance.~~

~~715.3 Location Standards~~

~~A neighborhood shopping center shall abut, front on, and have its principal access to and from a street designated by the Single Document Plan or by the Planning Commission, a collector street as defined in the Subdivision Regulations. A community or regional shopping center shall abut, front on, and have its principal access to and from a street designated by the Single Document Plan or by the Planning Commission as a primary or secondary thoroughfare.~~

~~The proposed shopping center shall be at a location where traffic congestion does not exist at present on the streets to be utilized for access to the proposed shopping center and where such congestion will be minimized by provisions in the plan for property entrances and exits, and by internal provisions for traffic circulation and parking.~~

~~The need for the proposed center at the proposed location, to provide adequate shopping facilities for the population which reasonably may be expected to be served by such shopping facilities.~~

~~The proposed shopping center shall be of sufficient size but not excessive size, to provide adequate shopping facilities for the population which reasonably may be expected to be served by such shopping facilities.~~

~~715.4 Minimum Design Standards~~

~~The following minimum standards shall be met in the design of an integrated shopping center.~~

- ~~A. No building shall exceed two and one half (2 2) stories or thirty five (35) feet in height except as provided in Section 504.6.~~

- ~~B. No building shall be less than fifty (50) feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the shopping center is located. The center shall be permanently screened from all abutting properties located in any residential district by an appropriate wall of acceptable design, except for necessary entrances and exits, from all properties located across the street and within one hundred (100) feet from such center in any residence district by a wall or hedge not less than three (3) feet in height. The exact type and nature of such screening shall be determined by the Planning Commission.~~
- ~~C. The ground area occupied by the building shall not exceed, in the aggregate, twenty five percent (25%) of the total area of the lot or tract.~~
- ~~D. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Ordinance Resolution, there shall be provided at least two (2) square feet of off-street parking area, including driveways, for every square foot of total usable retail floor space, not including basement storage space, in an integrated neighborhood shopping center; and three (3) square feet of off-street parking area for every square foot of total usable floor space, not including basement space, in an integrated community or regional center.~~
- ~~E. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Ordinance Resolution, there shall be provided one (1) off-street loading space for each ten thousand (10,000) square feet or fraction thereof of aggregate floor space of all buildings in the center. At least one-third (1/3) of the space required shall be sufficient in area and vertical clearance to accommodate trucks of the tractor-trailer type. Such loading facilities shall be permanently and fully screened from any residential district adjoining or facing said facilities.~~
- ~~F. Access ways and parking areas shall be lighted adequately by lighting fixtures which shall be installed as not to reflect light on adjoining properties and any public or private street right of way.~~
- ~~G. Subject to express approval by the Planning Commission, all signs within the center shall be controlled by written agreements between the owners and tenants of the center, or otherwise, to avoid excessive advertising and ensure a harmonious relationship to the center as a whole. All signs shall conform to the distance requirements from property lines for the building in the center. Projecting signs shall be prohibited. Two (2) freestanding shopping center identification signs may be authorized anywhere on the premises by the Planning Commission but no closer than twenty-five (25) feet from any property line. Said signs shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet in area and twenty-five (25) feet in height.~~
- ~~H. The minimum area required for a neighborhood shopping center shall be five (5) acres; the minimum area required for a community shopping center shall be fifteen (15) acres; and the minimum area for a regional center shall be thirty (30) acres.~~

~~715.5 Procedure~~

- ~~A. The owner or owners of a tract of land which meets the required area and locational standards of this provision shall submit to the Planning Commission for its review and consideration of, a preliminary development plan for an integrated shopping center.~~
- ~~B. The preliminary development plan shall show existing topography with contour intervals not greater than five (5) feet; the approximate size, location, and arrangement of all present and proposed buildings, landscape or buffer area, parking areas, driveways and points of ingress or egress, including their relationship to existing and proposed streets. The applicant shall also indicate the approximate total gross floor area of anticipated retail facilities, the approximate total gross floor area of anticipated office and other service facilities, the approximate number of anticipated off-street parking spaces, and the stages which will be followed in the construction of the proposed shopping center.~~
- ~~C. The plans shall provide for a shopping center consisting of one or more groups of establishments in buildings of integrated and harmonious design, together with adequate and properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The project shall be arranged in an attractive and efficient manner, convenient, pleasant and safe to use, and fitting harmoniously into, and having no adverse effects upon, adjoining or surrounding properties.~~

JUNE 17, 2014

- ~~D. In accepting such plan for review the Planning Commission must be satisfied that the proponents of the integrated shopping center are financially able to carry out the proposed project, that they intend to start construction within one (1) year of the approval of the project or necessary district change, and intend to complete it within a reasonable time as determine by the Planning Commission.~~
- ~~E. The need for the proposed center at the proposed location is to provide adequate shopping facilities or service to the surrounding neighborhood or community, as the case may be, which has been demonstrated by the applicant by means of market studies other evidence as the Planning Commission may require.~~

~~715.6 Conditional Uses~~

~~A. Neighborhood Shopping Center~~

~~Those principal uses permitted in the B-1 zoning district and similar convenient goods establishments which in the opinion of the Planning Commission are compatible retail stores for the convenient needs of the neighborhood area.~~

~~B. Community Shopping Center~~

~~Those uses permitted in the planned neighborhood shopping center, department stores, restaurants, banks and other compatible uses which in the opinion of the Planning Commission are appropriate establishments to meet the community shopping needs.~~

~~C. Medium Density Residential (See special provision 715.8)~~

~~715.7 Lot, Yard, and Height Requirements~~

Minimum Lot Size	Not applicable
Minimum Width at Building Line	Not applicable
Minimum Front Yard	30 feet
Minimum Each Side Yard	Not applicable
Minimum Rear Yard	50 feet
Maximum Height of Building	50 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage	25%

~~715.8 Special Provisions~~

- ~~A. Lot, Yard, and Height Requirements for Medium Density Residential shall be as required by R-3. (See 709.6)~~

~~715.9 Other Requirements~~

~~Parking See Article VI.~~

~~Sign See Article V, Section 508.~~

These amendments shall become effective after passage and publication as required by law.

Introduced and given first reading at a meeting of the VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL, Versailles, Kentucky, sitting at Versailles, Kentucky held on the 3rd day of June, 2014, and fully adopted after the second reading at a meeting of said City Council held on the 17th day of June, 2014.

VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL
STATE OF KENTUCKY

BRIAN TRAUGOTT, MAYOR

ATTEST: _____
ALLISON WHITE, CITY CLERK

JUNE 17, 2014

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY BRADLEY TO APPROVE AND ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 2014-30 A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, ARTICLE VII, B-3 DISTRICT, SECTION 715.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

At the request of Council member Bradley, City Attorney Moore gave second reading of Ordinance No. 2014-31 as follows:

**CITY OF VERSAILLES, KENTUCKY
ORDINANCE NO. 2014-31**

**A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT
ARTICLE II, DEFINITIONS,
SECTION 296**

WHEREAS, the Versailles-Midway-Woodford County Planning Commission has, after public hearings, and otherwise according to law recommended that Article II, Definitions, Section 296 be amended;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL, that the Versailles-Midway-Woodford County Zoning Ordinance -Article II, Section 296 be amended as follows:

296 Sign

Shall mean and include any outdoor announcement, declaration, device, demonstration or insignia used for direction, information, activity, services or any interests.

~~A. Advertising Sign — A (off premise) sign which attracts attention to any business product, activity or service; provided however, that such sign shall not be related, or make reference to the primary use, business, activity or service conducted on the premises~~

- A. Banner Sign - Any sign of lightweight fabric or similar material that is permanently mounted to a pole or building by a permanent frame at one or more edges. National flags, state or municipal flags or official flags of any institution or business shall not be considered banners.
- B. Business Sign - A (on-premise) sign which identifies a building or directs attention to a business, product, activity or service manufactured, sold, offered or stored upon the premises as the primary use(s) where such sign is located.
- C. Pennant or Streamer - Any lightweight fabric or similar material, whether or not containing a message of any kind, suspended from a rope, wire, or string, usually in series, designed to move in the wind.
- D. Political Signs - A temporary on-premise sign supporting the candidacy for office or urging action on any other matter on the ballot of a state, local or national election or referendum.
- E. Projecting Sign - A sign suspended from or supported by a building or similar structure and projecting out therefrom more than fifteen (15) inches.
- F. Sign Structure - The entire area within a single continuous perimeter enclosing all elements of the sign which form an integral part of the display.
- G. Wall Signs - A sign which is attached directly to a building wall and which does not extend more than fifteen (15) inches therefrom nor higher than the roof line of the building, with the exposed face of the sign in place parallel to the building wall.
- H. Free Standing Sign- A permanent sign erected on a framework not attached to any building, and attached to the ground, on one or more uprights or braces in the ground, whose purpose is to identify the name of a single user located on the lot with user.
- I. Monument Sign- A permanent Free Standing Sign which is completely self-supporting, has its sign face or base on the ground and has no air space, columns, or supports visible between the ground and the bottom of the sign face.

JUNE 17, 2014

J. Shopping Center Complex or Industrial Park Sign- A freestanding pylon or monument sign within a commercial or industrial development whose purpose is to identify the name of the development, its tenants and its major vehicular access points.

K. Project Entrance Sign-A freestanding monument sign within a residential, commercial, or industrial development whose purpose is to identify the name of the development (no tenants) and its major vehicular access points.

L. On-premise Sign- Any on-site sign on a permanent structure located on the premises to which sign pertains.

M. Off-premise Sign- Any off-site sign, available for rent, on a permanent structure on which the copy is periodically changed and which is not located on the premises which such advertising copy pertains.

These amendments shall become effective after passage and publication as required by law.

Introduced and given first reading at a meeting of the VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL, Versailles, Kentucky, sitting at Versailles, Kentucky held on the 3rd day of June, 2014, and fully adopted after the second reading at a meeting of said City Council held on the 17th day of June, 2014.

VERSAILLES CITY COUNCIL
STATE OF KENTUCKY

BRIAN TRAUGOTT, MAYOR

ATTEST: _____
ALLISON WHITE, CITY CLERK

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BRADLEY TO APPROVE AND ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 2014-31 A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, ARTICLE II, DEFINITIONS, SECTION 296.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

At the request of Council member Bradley, City Attorney Moore gave second reading of Ordinance No. 2014-32 (Attached as “Exhibit A” to minutes).

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY BRADLEY TO APPROVE AND ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 2014-32 A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, ARTICLE V, ZONING REGULATIONS, SECTION 508.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

At the request of Council member Bradley, City Attorney Moore gave first reading of Ordinance No. 2014-33 An Ordinance Repealing Section 34.051 of the Versailles Code of Ordinances.

At the request of Council member Bradley, City Attorney Moore gave first reading of Ordinance No. 2014-34 An Ordinance Repealing Section V of Part III of the Personnel Policies and Procedures and Pay/Classification Plan of the City of Versailles, Kentucky.

MOTION BY BRADLEY, SECONDED BY JONES TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE MUNICIPAL ROAD AID COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND RESOLUTION FOR FY 2015 AS PRESENTED BY THE KENTUCKY TRANSPORTATION CABINET.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

JUNE 17, 2014

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY JONES TO APPROVE THE RENEWAL OF THE NUISANCE MOWING CONTRACT WITH RONNIE WATKINS (WATKINS MOWING) THROUGH THE END OF THE 2015 MOWING SEASON AT THE SAME RATES MR. WATKINS QUOTED IN FOR THE MOWING SEASON QUOTE SUBMITTED BY WATKINS PROFESSIONAL LAWNS DURING MOWING SEASON 2011.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

Mayor Traugott noted that the proposed Kentucky Utilities Franchise Agreement was distributed for Council review and would be placed on the July 1, 2014 agenda for further action.

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY BRADLEY TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AND EXECUTE THE EMPLOYMENT AND RETAINER AGREEMENT WITH STURGILL, TURNER, BARKER AND MOLONEY TO REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF KENTUCKY CITIES IN THE KLCIS VS. KENTUCKY DEPT. OF INSURANCE LITIGATION FOR THE RECOVERY OF PRINCIPAL OF \$8 MILLION OF KLCIS’ WORKER’S COMPENSATION FUND THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY TRANSFERRED TO THE KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS INSURANCE TRUST (KSBIT).

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

The following quotes were submitted for the Water Valve Insertion System:

CI Thornburg Co.	\$41,703.00
Hydra-Stop	\$48,200.00

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE BID SUBMITTED BY CI THORNBURG IN THE AMOUNT OF \$41,703.00 FOR THE PURCHASE OF A WATER VALVE INSERTION SYSTEM.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

The following quotes were submitted for the purchase of 8 (2 each 6”, 8”, 10” and 12”) water valves:

CI Thornburg Co.	\$34,100.00
Hydra-Stop	\$34,118.00

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE BID SUBMITTED BY CI THORNBURG IN THE AMOUNT OF \$34,100.00 FOR THE PURCHASE OF EIGHT (8) WATER VALVES.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

Mitzi Delius presented the following quotes for repair evaluation of the Sand Pump at the Water Treatment Plant, further noting that the quotes do not include the actual repair costs after the pump is evaluated:

Service Specialties	\$4,383.00
Herrick Company, Inc.	\$5,884.00

MOTION BY KERKHOFF, SECONDED BY JONES TO AUTHORIZE THE UTILITIES MANAGER TO SEEK QUOTES FOR A NEW SAND PUMP, NOT TO EXCEED FOUR TIMES THE COSTS OF THE EVALUATION OF \$4,383.00, FOR A TOTAL OF \$17,600.00 VERSUS SPENDING THE \$4,383.00 FOR EVALUATION UNLESS THE COSTS FOR A NEW PUMP EXCEEDS THE \$17,600.00, AT WHICH TIME SERVICE SPECIALTIES WOULD RESUME WITH THE EVALUATION OF THE SAND PUMP.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

JUNE 17, 2014

The following quotes were submitted for the replacement of the filtrate pump at the Wastewater Treatment Plant:

KLM Sales and Service	\$2,855.00
Fluid Equipment	\$3,650.00

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE QUOTE AS PRESENTED BY KLM SALES AND SERVICE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,855.00 FOR THE PURCHASE OF A NEW REPLACEMENT FILTRATE PUMP AT THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

Bart Miller submitted the following quotes for tree removal services at the Versailles Cemetery and Rose Crest Cemetery, noting that Central Kentucky Tree Service does not carry Worker’s Compensation insurance and Lexington Tree Service, Inc. does, as required by the City’s Independent Contractor’s Agreement.

Lexington Tree Service, Inc.	\$2800.00
Central Kentucky Tree Service	\$2800.00 (No Worker’s Comp)

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE QUOTE AS PRESENTED BY LEXINGTON TREE SERVICE, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,800.00 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING TREE REMOVAL SERVICES AT THE VERSAILLES CEMETERY AND ROSE CREST CEMETERY.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

The Mayor presented a request from the Hope Ministries Food Pantry for the City to waive the water meter tap-on fee for their newly erected building.

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE REQUEST TO WAIVE THE WATER METER TAP-ON FEE FOR THE HOPE MINISTRIES FOOD PANTRY BUILDING.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

DEPARTMENT HEAD/COMMITTEE REPORTS

Water/Sewer Committee member Kerkhoff noted that the Committee had met regarding a request for a sewer adjustment at 505 Royal Ridge. Mr. Kerkhoff noted that the homeowner had not lived there for two years and had unusually high water/sewer bills. The property has since been sold and the new homeowners’ bill is now within normal usage range. Mr. Kerkhoff noted that the Committee recommends adjusting the sewer portion amount of \$749.84 contingent upon the previous homeowner providing proof of a plumber’s bill stating there were no leaks and proof of homeowners Ohio residency during the billing period.

MOTION BY KERKHOFF, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE SEWER ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FOR 505 ROYAL RIDGE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$749.84 CONTINGENT UPON THE PREVIOUS HOMEOWNER PROVIDING PROOF OF A PLUMBER’S BILL STATING THERE WERE NO LEAKS AND PROOF OF HOMEOWNERS OHIO RESIDENCY DURING THE BILLING PERIOD IN QUESTION.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

Mitzi Delius presented the following quotes for the installation of a 6” water line on Crossfield Drive:

Michael Poor Excavating	\$16,250.00
Walter Martin Excavating	\$18,450.00

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KERKHOFF TO APPROVE QUOTE AS PRESENTED BY MICHAEL POOR EXCAVATING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,250.00 FOR THE PURPOSE OF INSTALLING A 6” WATER LINE ON CROSSFIELD DRIVE.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

JUNE 17, 2014

The following quotes were submitted for the materials to complete the 6” water line on Crossfield Drive:

HD Supply Waterworks	\$7041.40
CI Thornburg Co., Inc.	\$7156.14
Consolidated Pipe and Supply	\$7196.39

MOTION BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE QUOTE AS PRESENTED BY HD SUPPLY WATERWORKS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7041.40 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PURCHASING MATERIALS TO COMPLETE THE 6’ WATER LINE ON CROSSFIELD DRIVE.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

Mayor Traugott noted that John Soper had submitted for the record, the following comments:

JOHN SOPER (FOR THE RECORD)

On May 6, 2014, Don C. Lewis, III, spokesperson for Citizens for Sustainable Growth, proposed the following ordinances for consideration and subsequent adoption by the City of Versailles. I cite this proposal as it appears on their Facebook page. Following each section of the proposal I give **my** response.

Proposal 1: Adopt a “Big Box Bond” ordinance. This would require Big Box stores to post a bond to cover the cost of demolition or refurbishment when the big box store abandons their original property, which we believe is inevitable.

Response: This is an attempt to change the game after the kickoff because we aren’t happy with a new player from the sidelines. A new Kroger has been in the works for over a year. The abandonment of their current property will lead to an empty building and possibly to the closure of Kmart as well. The Sustainable Growth outcry arose only when Walmart entered the picture. The Sustainable Growth proposal sends a message to national corporations that we really don’t want them in Woodford County. It is clearly anti-growth.

I doubt the sweeping conclusion that all Big Box stores inevitably move. Unless the state moves the Bluegrass Parkway, I doubt Walmart will find a better location than the one they have chosen.

If this new ordinance makes sense for retail stores then why not apply the same thing to schools or to big box factories? The Kuhlman building sat vacant for years. Should we have made those owners tear it down when they left town? If so we wouldn’t have the reinvestment that Ruggles Sign Company has made or their 100 employees.

Proposal 2: Adopt an ordinance addressing the highest standards for aesthetic and design requirements. We would suggest strict design policies, similar to those that were implemented in the City of Bardstown during the construction of the Walmart in their town.

Response: This part of the proposal is the most frightful of all. Any conversation that includes “design requirements” should strike fear in the hearts and wallets of Woodford County taxpayers. While Midway Station and the Versailles Center sit vacant, how much have the failed design standards of “new urbanism” cost us in terms of lost tax revenue from non-existent payroll and property taxes? The EDA is now saddled with \$4.7 million in debt on Midway Station nearly 20 years after it was started. Midway and the county paid close to \$2 million in interest that will never be recovered. The economic downturn in 2008 bears some of the burden for these failures. But design standards deserve most of the credit.

Were the design standards actually implemented “during the construction of the Walmart in [Bardstown]”? This seems somewhat unlikely unless Walmart agreed all along. The City of Versailles should begin talks with Walmart about design of the building once approval is granted and Walmart acquires the land. At that point the applicant will have abided by **our published** comp plan and zoning ordinances. Anything done before then will certainly chill the response city officials get.

Proposal 3: Adopt an ordinance addressing required tree plantings and other landscape installation to mitigate the unsightly appearance of this type of large commercial development.

Response: Once again this can only be read as anti-growth. On the one hand we say we want your business to locate in Woodford County, and then we tell you that you have to shield your business from view thus insuring your demise. Is the new Kroger unsightly or not? Walmart is already considered unsightly even though we have yet to see the first drawing. We never saw a rendering of the new Kroger until the groundbreaking. Where was the outcry, the fear of what they would build? Who will be empowered to call one business “unsightly” thus needing to be covered up with trees? How much are taxpayers going to have to pay for the new position of “tree police”?

JUNE 17, 2014

Proposal 4: Adopt an ordinance addressing imposing state of the art water quality protections on large commercial developments.

Response: If the goal is to shut down new commercial and industrial growth, this will do it.

I am unaware of any current Woodford County water quality problems. Thus, I believe the systems we have in place protect our environment. If not, then let's address whatever is broken rather than create an additional layer of bureaucracy. If we generate something locally that is not duplicated elsewhere so that national engineering firms have to "learn" it when they come to Woodford County, then the cost to relocate here immediately goes up.

In addition to the above proposed ordinances Mr. Lewis's remarks went on to address other concerns. I will address those as well.

Traffic: "In addition to the aforementioned proposals, we would also like to raise awareness concerning the significant and seemingly overlooked impact a Wal-Mart will have on traffic patterns in the area of the proposed location. These effects included but are not limited to an increase in traffic flow by three times the current rate....."

Response: Citizens for Sustainable Growth is correct in their assertion of traffic problems. Any new development can be expected to increase traffic flow and strain existing infrastructure. The answer is not to stop the project but to arrive at a solution. The state has previously granted an encroachment permit and it is up to state engineers and Walmart to arrive at a workable design. Citizen input should be directed to shaping the inevitable and not focused on closing a door that has already been opened. Citizens for Sustainable Growth go on to claim the following as it applies to the City Council: "Emergency response times are one variable that determine property insurance rates. As a Council, you will be held responsible for increases in property insurance rates for residents who live near and south of Walmart because of the certain traffic congestion near Bluegrass Parkway and Troy Pike." This assertion borders on fear mongering. Only a remote chance exists that Walmart traffic could impact insurance rates. I talked with two property and casualty insurance professionals, and they laughed at the concept. Craig McAnelly, the EDA Executive Director, says that poor response time city wide could lead to a city having its rating lowered, but it would affect the whole city and not just select sections. That data would be difficult to come by. Response time measurement is a gauge of a fire department's efficiency. A downgrade would take several years of poor response time over the entire city before a downgrade would occur.

Raise the minimum wage in Versailles over a three year period to \$10.10/hour for companies with more than 100 minimum wage employees.

Response: I can't see how this is a local option. Additionally, Woodford County has only a finite number of workers who will be candidates for the wage structure at Walmart. Employees may cross county lines to work at our Walmart. But few will probably come from two counties away. One could logically argue that with a new expanded Kroger and a new Walmart the competition for employees is going to heat up in favor of the employee. I believe that Walmart entering the market could raise the pay of many service workers even if they elect to stay in their current jobs. All of a sudden the employee has pricing power and can demand more pay from his or her existing employer due to the competition. Before Walmart what options did the employee have?

Doesn't the Citizens for Sustainable Growth plan hurt the small retailer by forcing Walmart, which will set the market price on this labor force, into \$10.10 an hour when something less could be mutually satisfactory to both employee and employer? The local mom and pop store we so desperately want to save would find itself in a bidding war for employees against Walmart, while the government escalates the bidding by enforcing a new higher minimum wage law. The smaller businesses will supposedly be protected by the 100 employee limitation. Inevitably, market forces dictate otherwise.

Going beyond my personal opinions on the potential ill effects of localized minimum wage increases, I would refer readers to an article published in the Wall Street Journal on May 30, 2014 that cited several experts as concluding that "the working poor face a disproportionate share of the job losses" attributable to state and federal minimum wage increases. The article concluded that minimum wage laws essentially outlaw work for those who cannot provide an employer enough value to at least match the mandated wage. In essence these attempts hurt the ones the proponents are claiming to help.

JUNE 17, 2014

In summary, these proposals have in my opinion *intended consequences and unintended consequences*. *Stopping Walmart is certainly an intended consequence*. Some would have you believe that Citizens would support a Walmart if it were on US 60. I think that is a convenient answer, as they know it would never happen. If Walmart wants to go to US 60 they would do so, as there is ample zoned land available: the Fields property to name one. Walmart chose their current site because they are arguably one of the best in the world at picking successful store locations. Who are we to argue, especially after we zoned the property for their intended use? *Stopping growth is both an intended consequence and an unintended consequence*. Some in this group know that growth will stop if these ordinances see the light of day, and their personal net worth will benefit. Some are fooled by feel good intentions and thus they don't see the unintended consequence that resulted in the failures of Midway Station and Versailles Center. *Raising the wage expense for small businesses is an unintended consequence*. This proposal combined with the other anti-growth measures intended or unintended will have a devastating impact on current businesses, as they will see labor costs increase while seeing revenue growth decline or flat line due to other new employers (such as manufacturing) choosing to locate elsewhere.

Woodford County has experienced a 17% job loss in the last 10 years. Our cost of living is higher than our neighboring communities because we have unwittingly restricted retail competition. This combination has resulted in a community that is perceived as wealthy, yet 21% of our population lives below the poverty line. Do we need more ordinances to perpetuate these results?

John Soper

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE GENERAL LEDGER DISTRIBUTION LIST (BILLS) DATED JUNE 17, 2014 AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN PROPERLY REVEIWED AND APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE DEPARPTMENT HEAD, MAYOR AND CITY TREASURER.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

MOTION BY JONES, SECONDED BY BRADLEY THAT THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ADJOURN.

The vote was as follows: Bradley, Ellis, Jones, Kerkhoff, Miller and Roberts voting aye.

APPROVED:

BRIAN TRAUGOTT, MAYOR

ATTEST:

ALLISON B. WHITE, CITY CLERK